DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 201 UD 022 694

AUTHOR London, Clement B.G.
TITLE Anthropology of the Classroom: Cultural Diversity, Its Meaning and Significance for Human Understanding, Communication and Student Interaction.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Acculturation; *Classroom Environment; *Classroom Research; *Cultural Pluralism; Curriculum Development; *Educational Anthropology; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Research Needs; Social Influences; Student Teacher Relationship

ABSTRACT

Rapid sociocultural and technological changes in American society demand that concomitant changes in education be made, based on a holistic view of the vast number of factors that affect education and life. Cultural anthropology, which emphasizes both holistic observation and analysis of micro situations, lends itself to the research approach needed to gain such a perspective, especially in combination with approaches provided by the other disciplines. A broad approach is especially significant in view of the multiethnicity of American society due to immigration. The problems and challenges for reform that face educators of culturally diverse populations raise questions that are difficult to answer from a narrow perspective. For instance, adopting either an assimilationist or a cultural pluralist ideology alone in dealing with educational change will result in incomplete analyses of situations. Collaboration among the disciplines is needed to provide a total picture of educational needs, and emphasis on cultural anthropology, especially the anthropology of the classroom, will greatly help efforts to improve education through a better understanding of student needs, teacher needs, and classroom communication processes. (MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227201

Anthropology of the Classroom: Cultural Diversity, Its Meaning and Significance for Human Understanding, Communication and Student Interaction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Clement B.G. London

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Clement B.G. London

Fordham University Graduate School of Education
At Lincoln Center
New York City, N.Y. 10023

UD 022 694

Anthropology of the Classroom: Cultural Diversity
Its Meaning and Significance for Human Understanding,
Communication and Student Interaction

American education continues the process of making rapid and basic changes. Many changes have been made primarily through growth in specialized functions, aimed at meeting the "compelling" exigencies of the moment. These micro interventions have been largely piece-meal, and they have been usually undertaken in a manner that often seemed unrelated to macro circumstances.

In this era of ever-accelerating technological, and socio-cultural changes, a disciplined, holistic approach seems necessary as a pre-condition to any endeavor which seeks to study traditional or alternative educational modalities. Attempts to shape and invent future educational alternatives, will require a considerable measure of rethinking among scholars and their sponsors.

Part of this rethinking is what Cremin (1976) characterizes as a very fundamental need. It is one that should require American educators to consider such critical issues as: the question as to where they should place the burden of their educational efforts, and also how these should be undertaken. Some of this rethinking should involve a consideration of the trends towards changes in local, national, and global events and environments; the involvement of family size, composition and stability; of mothers moving into areas of productive work outside the home, and the concomitant demand for

the formulation of public policies regarding the care and education of the young; of the pervasiveness of radio and television and other communications media in the lives of the citizenry; and, the educational impact of these changes on the fundamental modes of thinking, teaching, and learning.

Moreover, in considering the significance of work, for example, against a backdrop of increasing population and declining vital natural resources, there is a felt need for a constructive, fundamental rethinking of such matters as education for work, the educational dimensions of work, and the education needed as individuals develop within particular work settings. There is also a need for a consideration of the various shifts from one work setting to another or, the significance of work and leisure, as well as, the dynamic interrelationships between and among the persons who are being prepared for, or are involved in these engagements or interactions.

The import of these observations suggests as a basic requirement, the strategy of a broad-based, holistic response for addressing these pertinent issues. It implies the involvement of an international perspective for national issues; the inclusion of a conceptualization of global considerations requiring, not only comparative and hologeistic cross-cultural factors, but also the incorporation of scientific and collaborative participant support that will, in the final analysis, help point the direction in which the purveyors of public education may perhaps, invest their efforts and, in what measure, and to what ends.

For these and other reasons, those participants who are involved in efforts of educational transformation, must be willing and able to do better than undertake studies which merely analyze the family, or the church, or the school and its educational technology in isolation and then pronounce on their educational efforts. Their undertakings must transcend studies that scrutinize people through a single lens of class, or race, or religion, or ethnicity and, once again pronounce on superficial educational outcomes.

Cultural Anthropology and Education

Cultural anthropology is unique among the social sciences in its emphasis on holistic observation and analysis of relatively micro situations. It is seen as having a vital place among those disciplines which are used in the encompassing dimensions of educational investigations(Ogbu, 1979). Although the incorporation of anthropology in educational conceptualizations may not lead to rectification or salvation, much as a beleaguered public might hope, research has shown that the action which emanates from the careful critique or discourse that anthropology supplies, is at the very least, informed action.

Comitas (1978) lends credence to this observation. He notes that the implication of anthropology in educational issues brings advantages. Among these advantages is the view that the tradition of cross-cultural research creates awareness of artificial, though analytically useful, divisions and boundaries that are assumed to exist

between and among social aggregations. Durkheim's (1964) notions of collective representations and Weber's (1949) stress on the significance of individual motivation, for example, have informed subsequent research that has affected the significance of anthropology and education.

Within school situations, anthropological work depends heavily on intensive communication with educational personnel, not simply in order to gain entry, but to understand, define, and categorize parameters of problems within educational settings. This kind of interaction often involves close articulation with practising educators. Studying classroom interactions between students and teachers, the interface between schools and their communities, administrative tasks, the promulgation and evaluation of innovative programs, and the strains of conflict or events of crisis are issues which the incorporation of anthropology supports.

In essence, the qualitative focus of anthropology brings a much needed dimension to the typically quantitative studies of psychology, sociology, economics, and linguistics, in the domain of education. For example, in areas where the forces of socio-economic political, and cultural circumstances impact heavily on complexities of educational problems, various support disciplines integrated to form new combinations, can be utilized to examine and thus help to resolve such problems(Mott, 1973).

While the efficaciousness of a combined approach derives its sustenance from several bases, for the purposes of this paper, reference to particular bases seems most cogent. At this time, it is

appropriate for collaborating with colleagues in the quantitative fields of psychology, sociology, economics, political science, and linguistics for the examination of educational issues. It is a time for concerted effort, for just as ethnographers, for example, are reaching out and making use of quantitative research techniques colleagues working the quantitative mode, are increasingly reaching towards and using ethnographic description as a means of qualifying, interpreting, and understanding results of quantitative analyses in educational research (Textor, 1977).

Likewise, the exponentially increasing pace of socio-cultural change within the United States will correspondingly require the input derived from collaborative efforts, for the reevaluation and reorganization of educational goods and services, if only for the purpose of keeping pace with change. This consideration is particularly pertinent in a post industrial culture, one characterized by pervasive knowledge and high communications technology, and requiring new and improved educational conceptualizations to match increasingly new damands (Bell, 1973; Theobald, 1968, 1976).

There is also a sense in which the parallelism of Ruth Benedict's concept of social synergy becomes cogent. Viewed in relation to cross-cultural dynamics, Benedict's concept of social synergy, which refers to the combined efforts of social institutions reinforcing one another, has application for the current discourse on the plural structure of the population and its implication for education. One can perceive of the interelationships between and

among various ethnic groups as reinforcing one another and thus, creating a social cohesion that is greater than the purely arithmetical sum of the individual groups (Barnouw, 1980).

The interfacing of the disciplines of psychology, sociology, anthropology, and linguistics on specific educational components has the potential for producing a more comprehensive examination and thus, a better understanding of educational phenomena. This is a logical point of departure on the long and arduous road to the resolution of educational problems.

The assumption then, is that there is a reasonable justification for psychology, sociology, economics, anthropology, and linguistics to collaborate on macro educational analyses, and for some continuing articulation between and among local, regional, and national levels about issues of common educational interests. This articulation should include the sharing of findings gleaned from the incorporation of related disciplines. A primary objective of such interdisciplinary analyses should be to provide an ever-widening theoretical base, sot that resulting policy can be made more reasonably, on the basis of empirical findings, and not necessarily on polemics. When such empirical findings are considered in policy decisions, they ought to be done with caution, and in a manner very much like the way that applied anthropology has demonstrated.

The remaking of America is not going to be accomplished overnight. All researchers are ware of this. However, a cogent reminder should go out in respect of the need to avoid the lure of sensationalism which is frequently associated with journalism. The urge should be for continued search without prejudging the answers,

and an effort to understand and address the problems as they exist in American education.

The Multiethnic Landscape In Its Historical Context

The United States has traditionally grappled with the dilemma of the assimilationist and pluralistic viewpoints of its social structure. Confusion established by the dichotomy of the dialectic emanates from competing positions, ideologies, and discourses (Banks, 1976).

The cutting edge of the problem seems to have been sharpened with the arrival of the second wave of immigrants from Southern, Central, and Eastern Europe between 1890 and 1917. The arrivals who preceded this group came largely from Northern and Western Europe. Because of their cultural differences, religions, and competition for jobs with native-born Americans, a nativistic movement arose to halt the inflow of new immigrants.

Nativism became widespread throughout the United States, and influenced the nation's institutions, including the schools. The outbreak of World War 1 in Europe greatly increased the nativistic expression within the larger society. The schools in turn, tried to make the immigrants one hundred percent Americans, and to exclude all elements of 'foreigness' from the curriculum (Banks, 1981). The debate on the dichotomy between the traditional nativistic and the assimilationist viewpoint with the recent addition of the pluralist view continues.

Banks (1976) believes that the pluralist and the assimilationist concerns are important: the one for self respect and, the other, for the eventual establishment of the dynamic American identity. A few philosophers and writers (Bourne, 1916; Drachsler, 1920; and Kallen, 1924) have argued on behalf of the immigrants for cultural democracy; but their early arguments have had little influence. More recently, proponents of the pluralistic viewpoint (Banks, 1981; Bennett, 1981; Black and Anderson, 1975; Gold et al., 1977; Cross et al., 1977; Longstreet, 1978; Van Til, 1959) have orchested this concern.

Under the rubric of pluralism, defined as a state of society in which members of diverse racial, ethnic, religious or social groups maintain autonomous participation in and development of, their traditional cultures or special interests within the confines of a common civilization, these writers sought to influence thinking on the matter.

The fact of the matter is that most institutions within the United States remained essentially assimilationist between the two World Wars, and therefore devoted little time and attention to the educational needs and problems of ethnic minority groups. Despite the restrictive Immigration Acts of 1907, 1921, and 1924, recent liberal changes in immigration policy have attracted "newer" immigrants, particularly from Southeast Asia, Africa, the Caribbean, and Latin America. It is important to note that these external movements also coincided with internal movements of Blacks from the rural South to northern American urban areas. Much of the rhetoric which surrounds the current discourse on ideological stances, has its

genisis in these changes in the social structure. They affect and are affected by the educational institutions, their goods and services, personnel and policies, as well as their administration.

Competing Ideologies

Banks' (1981) treatment of multiethnic education theory and practice shows that reforms related to ethnic or cultural diversity remain primarily on the periphery of American education. He argues that the resistance to pluralistic reform is essentially ideological. Most educators and policy makers who control the schools are assimilationist-oriented and, therefore, see forms of pluralistic education as being inconsistent with their values, commitments, and beliefs. Proponents of the pluralistic modality counter with equal arguments. Neither the assimilationists not the cultural pluralists can singlehandedly address educational reform. On the other hand, they can both complement each other.

The United States has a universal culture which is heavily influenced and shared by all ethnic groups. Therefore, programs based primarily on assimilationsit assumptions are likely to perpetuate misconceptions about the nature of American society and, therefore, stand to violate the ethnic identity of many citizens. Educational practices which reflect an extreme notion of cultural pluralism also have the potential for distorting American realities and give inadequate attention to the universal culture which strongly influences the behavior of all American citizens.

Both the assimilationist and the cultural pluralist ideologies emanate from incomplete analyses of the nature of ethnicity in contemporary American society. The assimilationist ideology derives from two main conceptions: Anglo conformity and the melting pot idea. The cultural pluralist ideology emanates from a conceptualization of ethnicity in American society called cultural pluralism (Bennett, 1981; Thomas, 1981).

According to Banks (1981), Anglo conformity suggests that the groups gave up their cultural attributes and acquired those of Anglo Saxon Protestants. This assumption also conveys the implication that assimilation has been unidirectional. The melting pot, long embraced as an ideal in American society and culture, suggests that the various ethnic cultures within America were mixed and synthesized into a new culture, different from any of the original ethnic cultures.

Cultural pluralism, at least in its extreme form, suggests that the nation is made up of various ethnic subsocieties, each of which has a set of largely independent norms, institutions, values, and beliefs.

Each of these conceptualizations is somewhat incomplete and, therefore, misleading. The Anglo conformity concept suggests that the Anglo Saxons have changed very little, if any, and that all other groups did all of the changing. The melting pot concept fails to recognize some critical and complex dynamisms that are usually associated with human aggregations. The cultural pluralist concept overlooks the reality of a universal American culture shared by all Americans, their ethnic antecedents being very substantive. Aspects

of this universal American culture include such values as the veneration of materialism and consumption, success and progress, as well as a capitalistic economy.

Both assimilationist and pluralist concepts are insufficient for explaining educational problems, and for addressing needed reforms. Inherent in these two major conceptions and the dialectic which they generate, is the possibility that they open up a continuing dialogue, particularly in the area of multiple acculturation. In addition, they expose for research consideration, questions such as the following:

a. Did the Anglo Saxon Protestant culture have the greatest influence on the development on the United States universal culture? How much, and in what areas?

b. Did the various ethnic cultures influence the Anglo culture, and were they influenced by it; and, to what extent?

c. Did the various cultures influence each other, and if so, to what extent?

d. How has the complex series of acculturations mediated by the United States experience within the socio-cultural environment, resulted in the universal culture?

These are a few of the numerous questions that research may help to clarify. But since they are so encompassing in their import and ramification, they will demand a concomitant in-depth examination for feasible explanations. Such examination will, of necessity, require the scope of multi-disciplines, integrated for breadth of focus. Here the collaborative use of the disciplines of psychology, sociology, anthropology, and linguistics should prove helpful as a beginning. Broadening of the scope in the use of still more disciplines should prove to be even more efficacious.

The New Complex Multiethnic School Population

It has already been established elsewhere in this paper that cultural anthropology in its ethnographic mode, stands unique among the social sciences because of its emphasis on holistic observation and analysis. Education for the children of urban America is a concern that can profit from the inclusion of anthropological methodology. Getting a rational picture of the current educational landscape of urban America with its kaleidoscopic clientele is of imminent need.

Sheila Rule (1980:28) writes in the New York Times that, "America is again faced with the challenge of educating children, not only in a new language and other basic skills, but also in the kaleidoscopic dimensions of life in this country." In comparing yesterday's with today's migrants to America's cities, Rule notes that in contrast to some of the better educated and more economically stable immigrants of recent decades, those who constitute the new tide of immigrants have greater learning problems. Was she echoing the sentiments of the public at large? She also observes that the situation is further complicated, in that some more recent immigrants, "boat people" from such places as Cuba, Haiti, and Indo-China, who have begun their lives under dictatorial regimes, are finding their adjustment as much a political as well as a cultural and educational problem.

As a consequence of the chaotic circumstances which uprooted them, and the subsequent years in refugee camps, some come to the United States with psychological problems that may be incorrectly diagnosed as learning disability. These observations point up one dimension of the complexity of urban educational problems with which educators must inevitably deal. This is also in addition to numerous, critical problems which already

dot the educational landscape.

There should be little doubt that these new group presence will further exacerbate existing conditions. How does a teacher begin to teach children with so many difficulties? What kind of preparation should classroon teachers have for handling such intangibles as educational difficiencies that are directly related to students' backgrounds? How different are the cultures of the new student clientele, for example, from that of the teachers who will have to teach them, or other students who must share classroom spaces with them? Moreover, writers, philosophers and educators are yet to resolve the ongoing ideological dialogue as to what the focus should be. Perhaps a synthesis of both will suffice.

But while the dialogue continues and the public await answers, teachers are confronted with their student-clientele in classrooms, wherein they must grapple with these intangibles as a part of their responsibility while presenting content material. What should teachers do in the meantime? How should they proceed to teach, given these circumstances? What do they need to know about these telling problems which they encounter?

Since teachers are expected to effectuate the blueprint for a literate society, this responsibility should be buttressed by the provision of appropriate educational goods and services, as part of their preparation for dealing with the culturally different. Ideally, this preparation should include, among other things, new curricula for the preparation of teachers. This might include techinques and materials for the culturally different, within the structure of programs that are systematic and coherent; and, having the scope for the facilitation of logical thinking, feeling, acting, and communicating (Brown, 1963). There is a concern, not only with cognition, but also with vital areas as feeling and acting associated with the serious act of establishing the teaching-learning transaction.

Cultural Diversity: Meaning and Significance for Human Understanding and Communication in the Classroom

Ginot (1972) answers his own question: Where do we start if we are to improve life and learning in the classroom? by suggesting that teachers aught to examine how they respond to students, how students respond to teachers, and how students respond to one another. He reasons that this communication, this response, particularly from the teacher, is of utmost importance, because while teachers are not usually overly concerned about whether their response conveys acceptance or rejection, to many a student, this difference may be fatal or fateful. Such factors are critical at school.

Part of a teacher's response to students must focus on those unique non-verbal communicative vibrations which students radiate. A non-verbal symbol stands for a complex and diffuse reflection of experience which is emotional, cognitive, and conative. While words tend to represent consciously articulated mental states, the evocative power of non-verbal symbols stretches beyond consciousness. The specific function is to indicate what cannot be normally articulated by words or by language in general.

In the teaching-learning relationship, the students' personalities become important factors as students make their adjustment in the new environment. Therefore, what a teacher needs to know and do in the classroom transcend responses and the teaching of his or her subject matter. A teacher, forinstance needs to unlearn habitual language of rejection, and to acquire a new language of acceptance. Instead of using the techniques of blaming, shaming, preaching, moralizing, accusing, belittling, and threatening which carry negative connotations, teachers should be establishing a warm classroom climate in which teaching and learning may be engendered. New educational content and strategies are required for coping with these crucial intangibles which are really at the heart of many educational problems.

The special significance of a positive classroom climate is grounded on the notion of a healthy interaction between and among students, teachers, and parents. This interaction facilitates the teaching-learning transaction (Alley, 1980; Aspy, 1969; Becker, 1952; Carkhuff, 1977; Gazda et al., 1977; Griffith and London, 1980; Haubrich, 1963; London, 1978; Simpson, 1980; and Tjosvold, 1980).

Establishing a positive classroom climate requires skill and sensitivity. Teachers who possess generic cultural sensitivity have the ability to detect potential problems. It also enables them to "cue" into, and get infromation about, and develop understanding of, familiar and unfamiliar sources of cultural conflict which often stymie classroom teaching (Button, 1977).

From a teacher's viewpoint, there must be a willingness to respond realistically and honestly to students' cultural nuances, agreeing not to treat them as butts of silly jest. One should, for example, avoid pre-conceived notions about students' abilities. One aught not to confuse learning styles with learning ability. Being different does not necessarily mean difficult or deficient. As there are differences within groups, so too must teachers and students recognize differences between them, and strive for a better understanding of each other, while accepting the validity of all cultures and students' individuality(Banks,1975).

Teachers must persist in maintaining the teacher-parent-student network in order to stabilize and improve contact, minimize conflict, establish rapport, trust and confidence, and, to keep the lines of communication open.

Of paramount importance to all of these suggestions and observations are the teachers' own personality and teaching styles; the awareness of their own difficulties and need for improvement. Teachers must have many qualities, including being at peace with themselves; having faith in themselves and in their ability to accomplish, to change and be changed; and trusting students and being trusted by them, their parents, and significant others in their lives.

Teachers' body language, tone of voice, and amount of time devoted to students for counsel tell something about their character. What teachers say is as important as what they do not say. Teachers should establish rational relationships of understanding, and then use them as part of their support system in classroom teaching. If they lack necessary skills, then they should strive to acquire them through self-study, on-the-job training, or through special courses of study offered at institutions of higher education. Ignorance should not be offered as an excuse for failure, nor should they seek to write off incompetence simply on the excuse of having difficult students to deal with. Such answers are much too simplistic for very complex problems.

Classrooms often provide scope for empirical investigation. At best the more comprehensive the undertaking, the greater the likelihood that the findings will be substantive. By incorporating the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, psychology, and linguistics in a study of classroom issues, a group can look very critically at concerns of teaching and learning as they affect and are affected by, ethnically different students, for example. Studying the anthropology of the classroom, may require the comprehensive address of some larger, though pertinent questions, such as:

1. Does the attention given to the development of an understanding of ethnic group identification in classroom situations help relationships and promote learning?

II. How can a teacher use curricular content in Mathmetics, Language Arts, and Social Studies instruction to promote individual and ethnic group consciousness in a classroom? How does this procedure improve achievement scores?

III. What effect can an inservice training program that is designed to improve classroom climate, have on teachers who are so exposed? How would the program be developed and, what measures of evaluation will be used?

IV. How does the recognition of students' belief systems improve student behavior, promote classroom interaction, and improve subject matter competence?

V. What effect does the belief in self, change in attitude,and teaching styles affect student behavior and subject matter competence?

VI. What effect does an inservice teacher-training program have on teacher classroom performance and student classroom behavior and subject-matter competence?

VII. What effect does the ignoring of the presence of divergent cultural backgrounds of classroom students have on classroom participation and subject matter mastery?

VIII. What effects does the networking of parent-student-teacher communication have on classroom interaction and academic performance?

IX. Does the issue of cultural or ethnic differences really affect classroom behavior and achievement; and, if so, in what manner, and to what extent?

X . Are there differences in classroom performance and achievement between and among groups of teachers and students of similar backgrounds who are exposed to similar curricula/ information?

XI. How do the attitudes and values of teachers and students of different ethnic groups differ; in urban areas; in suburban area classrooms?

XII. How do teachers, students and parents differ on their views of the importance of ethnic studies; on their views of trust between teachers and students, between students and students, and between teachers and parents?

XIII. Is academic achievement greater among students to whom extra attention is given to their special ethnic concerns? Is classroom behavior or subject matter participation greater among students so affected?

XIV. Which ethnic groups most frequently prefer this special attention?

REFERENCES

Aspy, D. N.
1969 "The effects of teacher-offered conditions of empathy, congruency, and positive regard upon student achievement." Florida Journal of Educational Research 11,1: 39-48.

Banks, J. A.
1975 Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Banks, J. A., C. E. Cortes, G. Gay, R. Garcia, and A. S. Ochoa.
1976 Curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education. Arlington, Virginia: National Council for the Social Studies.

Banks, J. A.
1981 Multiethnic Education Theory and Practice. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Barnouw, V.
1980 "Ruth Benedict" The American Scholar 49, 4:540-509.

Becker, H. S.
1952 "Social class variations in the teacher-pupil relationship." Journal of Educational Sociology 25: 451-463.

Bell, D.
1973 The Coming of Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting. New York: Basic Books.

Bennett, C.
1981 "A Ccase for pluralism in schools." Phi Delta Kappan, 62,8: 589-591.

Cremin, L. A.
1976 Public Education. New York: Basic Books.

Cross, D. E.
1977 Testing a Multicultural Society: Perspectives and Professional Strategies. New York: The Free Press.

Drachsler, J.
1920 Democracy and Assimilation: The Blending of Immigrant Heritages in America. New York: Macmillan.

Durkheim, E.
1964 Essays on Sociology and Philosophy.
New York: Harper and Row.

Gazda, G. M., F. R. Asbury, F. J. Balzer, W. C. Childers, and R. P. Walters. Human Relations Development. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Ginot, H.
1972 Teacher and Child. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Gold, M., C.A. Grant, and H.N. Rivlin.
1977 In Praise of Diversity: A Resource Book for Multicultural Education. Washington, D.C.:Teacher Corps - Association of Teacher Educators.

Griffith, A.R. and C.B.G. London.
1980 "Student relations among inner city teachers: a comparative study by teacher race." Education, 101,2:139-147.

Haubrich,
1963 "Teachers for big city schools," In A.H. Passow, ed. Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kallen, H.M.
1924 Culture and Democracy in the United States: Studies in the Group Psychology of the American Peoples. New York:Boni and Liveright Publishers.

London, C.B.G.
1978 "Sensitizing the New York City teacher to the Caribbean Student." In L. Golubchick and B. Persky, eds., Perspectives in Bilingual Education. 95-103, Manhassett Hill, New York: Avery Publishing Group.

Longstreet, W.S.
1978 Aspects of Ethnicity: Understanding Differences in Pluralistic Classrooms. New York: Teachers College Press.

Mott, G.F.
1973 "An overview: sensitivities of compulsive and planned change," The Annals, 405: 1-6.

Ogbu, J.U.
1979 "Social stratification and the socialization of competence." Anthropology and Education, 10,1: 3-20.

Rule, S
1980 "Educators take on new refugee wave." New York Times, November 16, 28 EDC.

Textor, R.
1977 "Future horizons in anthropology and education:the view from 1976." Anthropology and Education, 8,1: 31-34.

Theobald, R.
1968 An Alternative Future for America 11. Chicago: Swallow Press.

_____.
1976 Beyond Despair: Directions for America's Third Century. Washington, D.C.: New Republic Book Company.

Thomas, D.M.
1981 "The limits to pluralism." Phi Delta Kappan, 62,8: 589-592.

Tjosvold, D.
1980 "Control, conflict and collaboration in the classroom." Education Forum, 44: 195-203.

Van Til,
1959 "Instructional methods in intercultural and intergroup education." Review of Educational Research. 367-377.

Weber, M.
1949 On the Methodology of the Social Sciences. (tr. and ed. Edward A. Shils and Henry A. Finch), Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.